

1 Ann-Martha Andrews, Nevada Bar No. 007585  
2 Kristina N. Holmstrom, Nevada Bar No. 010086  
3 OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.  
4 2415 East Camelback Road, Suite 800  
5 Phoenix, AZ 85016  
6 Telephone: 602.778.3700  
7 Fax: 602.778.3750  
8 ann.andrews@ogletree.com  
9 kristina.holmstrom@ogletree.com  
10 *Attorneys for Defendant First Reliance Standard  
11 Life Insurance Company*

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 JOHN SCOTT BURRIS,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 vs.  
13 FIRST RELIANCE STANDARD LIFE  
14 INSURANCE COMPANY,  
15 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:20-CV-00999-APG-BNW

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**[PROPOSED] DISCOVERY PLAN AND  
SCHEDULING ORDER**  
**(Special Scheduling Review Requested)**

17 Plaintiff John Scott Burris and defendant First Reliance Standard Life Insurance  
18 Company jointly request special scheduling review and submit the following discovery plan and  
19 scheduling order for this case.

20 **I. Rule 26(f) Conference.**

21 In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f), conferences were held on September 23, 2020  
22 and thereafter between Patrick R. Leverty and Rueben H. Cawley, counsel for Burris, and Ann-  
23 Martha Andrews, counsel for Reliance Standard. The parties agree that the standard discovery  
24 plan is not best suited for this case, which is governed by the Employee Retirement Income  
25 Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq., for the reasons set forth in more detail  
26 below.

1       **II. Nature of the Case and Purpose of Special Review.**

2       This lawsuit arises out of Burris's claim for long-term disability benefits under a plan  
 3 established and maintained by his employer, Wilson Elser, and funded via a policy of group  
 4 long-term disability insurance issued by Reliance Standard. Burris's Complaint alleges a claim  
 5 for benefits under ERISA.

6       ***Plaintiff's view.*** Currently, Plaintiff is seeking to amend the Complaint in part to ensure  
 7 that the claims and defenses raised in the administrative record ("AR") below are litigated in this  
 8 action for Plaintiff's long-term disability benefits arising out of Plaintiff's doctor's final  
 9 diagnosis of disability May and June 2019. Plaintiff was ultimately diagnosed with Chronic  
 10 Fatigue Syndrome, as supported in part by a positive test for reactivated Epstein Barr Virus.  
 11 Plaintiff's doctor began with a preliminary diagnosis of "depression" as Plaintiff's disability,  
 12 which the doctor eliminated, along with other possible diagnoses, over a period of 6 months  
 13 (December 2018 to May 2019).

14       The parties dispute whether Defendant properly preserved and produced material  
 15 evidence that should be part of the administrative record for this case, as alleged in the  
 16 Complaint. Additionally, Plaintiff seeks to prove that Defendant has a structural conflict of  
 17 interest. Plaintiff also seeks to prove that that Defendant did not follow the Plan documents nor  
 18 ERISA requirements and acted far outside of the boundaries for conferring discretion. Plaintiff  
 19 also seeks to prove that several other factors exist to show that a de novo (or a heightened)  
 20 standard of review of the administrative record is proper.

21       The parties dispute the applicable standard of review.

22       ***Defendant's View.*** The Court will decide the merits of the case based only upon the  
 23 administrative record (the claim file). The operative plan documents confer discretion on the  
 24 claim administrator, Reliance Standard, such that the Court will apply the abuse of discretion  
 25 standard in deciding the merits of the case. While some discovery into the dual-role conflict may  
 26 be appropriate, the discovery must be narrowly-tailored to the facts of the specific case.

27       **III. Proposed Plan.**

- 1       A. **Disclosure of the Administrative Record:** October 23, 2020
- 2       B. **Amendment of Pleadings and Addition of Parties:** December 4, 2020
- 3       C. **Deadline to Complete Discovery:** February 1, 2021
- 4       D. **File the Administrative Record:** January 8, 2021
- 5       E. **Plaintiff's Opening Brief:** February 1, 2021
- 6       F. **Defendant's Response Brief:** March 1, 2021
- 7       G. **Plaintiff's Optional Reply Brief:** March 15, 2021

8       **IV. Electronically Stored Information.**

9       The parties do not anticipate any issues relating to the disclosure, discovery, or  
10      preservation of ESI at this time. If issues arise, the parties will meet and confer and present a plan  
11      to the Court.

12      **V. Privilege Issues.**

13      The parties do not currently propose any agreement relating to claims of privilege. In the  
14      event that discovery is conducted and claims of privilege or protection are made, the parties will  
15      work together to present a stipulated confidentiality order to the Court.

16      ***Plaintiff's View.*** Plaintiff has respectfully requested that information that is private or  
17      may be embarrassing if made public be redacted in the public facing documents.

18      **VI. LR 26-1 Certifications.**

19      In accordance with LR 26-1(b)(7), the parties certify that they have met and conferred  
20      regarding the possibility of using alternate dispute-resolution processes and have agreed to  
21      schedule a private mediation at an appropriate time.

22      In accordance with LR 26-1(b)(8), the parties certify that they have met and conferred  
23      about alternate forms of case disposition including consent to trial by a magistrate judge and the  
24      use of the Short Trial Program.

25      The provisions of LR 26-(b)(9) do not apply as no jury trial has been demanded and none  
26      is permitted in this ERISA matter.

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of October 2020.

2 LAW OFFICES OF  
3 REUBEN H. CAWLEY.

4 By: s/ Reuben H. Cawley (w/ permission)  
5 Rueben H. Cawley  
6 Nevada Bar No. 9384  
7 Utah Bar No. 10304  
8 10040 W. Cheyenne Av. Ste. 170-244  
9 Las Vegas, NV 89129  
10 Ph: (702) 882-3363  
11 Fax: (702) 964-1367  
12 [Rcawley.esq@gmail.com](mailto:Rcawley.esq@gmail.com)

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff John Scott Burris*

14 OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK &  
15 STEWART, P.C.

16 By: s/ Ann-Martha Andrews  
17 Ann-Martha Andrews, NV Bar No. 007585  
18 Kristina N. Holmstrom, NV Bar No. 010086  
19 2415 East Camelback Road, Suite 800  
20 Phoenix, AZ 85016  
21 Tel.: 602.778.3700  
22 Fax: 602.778.3750  
23 ann.andrews@ogletree.com  
24 kristina.holmstrom@ogletree.com

25 *Attorneys for Defendant First Reliance  
26 Standard Life Insurance Company*

27 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

28 **DATED:** 3:50 pm, October 09, 2020



29 **BRENDA WEKSLER**  
30 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**